IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NO LABELS,

Plaintiff.

Civil Action No. 23-1384-GBW

v.

NOLABELS.COM, INC.,

Defendant.

TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

AND NOW this 15th day of December 2023, at 3:25 p.m., the Court having considered the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against Defendant NoLabels.com, Inc. ("Defendant") filed by Plaintiff No Labels ("Plaintiff") (D.I. 3), and having held a hearing on the Temporary Restraining Order on December 15, 2023, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (D.I. 3) is GRANTED.¹ Based on Plaintiff's Motion and supporting documents, as well as evidence and arguments presented at the hearing, the Court finds that Plaintiff demonstrated: (1) that a temporary restraining order should be issued given that Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable harm in

¹ Plaintiff and Defendant both agreed that they discussed limiting the hearing on December 15, 2023 to only the Court's consideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order. Defendant asserted that the parties agreed to not include the request for a Preliminary Injunction as part of the requested relief during this hearing. Plaintiff did not deny Defendant's understanding, but alleged that there was some ambiguity in the parties' respective understanding of the outcome of the discussion. For that reason, the Court will rule only on the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order today and will schedule a future hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction after completion of expedited discovery.

absence of immediate relief; (2) the likelihood of success on the merits of the trademark infringement claim in its Complaint; (3) that it will suffer irreparable harm in the form of loss of control of reputation and goodwill if immediate injunctive relief is not granted; (4) that Defendant's conduct is likely to cause confusion and harm to the public, which confusion and harm will continue in absence of immediate relief; (5) that Defendant will not suffer harm if injunctive relief is granted; and (6) that entry of a temporary restraining order is in the public's interest.

- 2. Accordingly, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 and Section 34 of the Lanham Act, Defendant, along with its officers, directors, principals, agents, representatives, servants, employees, affiliates, successors, or assigns, or any person or entity acting on its behalf or in concert or participation with it, is hereby temporarily restrained and enjoined from further using and/or infringing the NO LABELS mark pending further hearing and determination of this action and/or until further Order of the Court, and specifically ordered to: (1) take down and not restore the Infringing Website; and (2) cease all other activities that infringe the NO LABELS mark.
- 3. On or before December 18, 2023, Plaintiff shall post bond in the amount of \$250,000 and shall provide the Court and Defendant with evidence that the bond has been posted. In the event that Plaintiff fails to post the bond as required herein, this temporary restraining order may be withdrawn by Order of the Court.
- 4. This Order and injunctive relief granted herein shall remain in place for fourteen (14) days and may be extended for an additional period for good cause.
- 5. The parties shall meet and confer on or before 5:00 p.m. ET on Monday, December 18, 2023. The parties shall file a joint status report, not to exceed three (3) pages, on or before

5:00 p.m. ET on Tuesday, December 19, 2023. The joint status report shall update the Court on any agreements the parties have reached on the scope of expedited discovery, the schedule of expedited discovery, and proposed dates for a preliminary injunction hearing. To the extent the parties are unable to reach complete agreement on the scope of expedited discovery, the schedule of expedited discovery, and/or proposed dates for a preliminary injunction hearing, the parties shall specify the portions to which they agree and submit their respective proposals on the portions to which they are not in agreement.

GREGORY B. WILLIAMS U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE